

**Office of Educational Research and Improvement  
Fund for the Improvement of Education Program**

**Comprehensive School Reform  
Capacity Building Grants**

**84.215C**

**Deadline for Transmittal of Applications: June 9, 2000**

Application for Grants  
Under the  
Fund for the Improvement  
Of Education Program  
CFDA # 84.215C

Form Approved  
OMB No. 1850-0539, Exp. Date 11/30/2001

Comprehensive School Reform Capacity  
Building Grants

U.S. Department of Education  
Office of Educational Research and Improvement  
Fund for the Improvement of Education Program  
Washington, DC 20208-5645

Phone: (202) 219-2116  
Fax: (202) 219-2053  
E-mail: [judy\\_collins@ed.gov](mailto:judy_collins@ed.gov)

<http://www.ed.gov/oeri/orad/fie.html>

Deadline for Transmittal of Applications:  
6/9/2000

## ESTIMATED PUBLIC REPORTING BURDEN

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1850-0637. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 24 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. **If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate(s) or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202-4651. If you have comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission of this form, write directly to:**

Fund for the Improvement of Education Program  
Attn: 84.215C  
U.S. Department of Education  
555 New Jersey Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20208-5645

**Application for Grants**  
**Fund for the Improvement of Education Program**  
**Comprehensive School Reform Capacity Building Grants**

**Table of Contents**

Dear Applicant Letter.....	page 5
Copy of Federal Register Notice.....	page 7
General Program Information.....	page 14
What are the Selection Criteria? .....	page 15
GPRA .....	page 16
How do I apply?	
—The Application.....	page 17
—The Appendices .....	page 19
How do I submit an application? .....	page 22
Intergovernmental Review.....	page 24
Application Checklist.....	page 31
Important Notice to Prospective Participants.....	page 32
APPENDIX	
1. Authorizing Legislation.....	page 34

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND IMPROVEMENT

Dear Colleague,

We are pleased to announce the Fund for the Improvement of Education (FIE) Program's Comprehensive School Reform Capacity Building Grants Competition for fiscal year (FY) 2000. The purpose of this competition is to further develop the long-term capacity of mature and viable comprehensive school reform (CSR) models to serve increasingly large numbers of schools with high quality services.

Through the Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration (CSRD) program, Congress invested \$145 million in both 1998 and 1999 to support the implementation of CSR in high poverty schools. In FY 2000 the amount of funds available to schools under CSRD was increased to \$200 million. This has put a strain on many of the more successful models, which are trying to think strategically about how they can effectively scale up to serve more schools.

As this national effort to reform schools unfolds, it has become increasingly apparent that we need to know a great deal more about how to scale up successfully. At the same time, we have learned much in a short time that can guide our current work. As you consider whether and how to respond to this announcement to award grants to increase the capacity of CSR models, let me offer the following:

- While the initial expectation was that implementation of a model alone could bring about and sustain higher levels of student achievement, it has become increasingly clear that the conditions developers encounter in schools and districts greatly influence implementation. What works or does not work in a school may be as much a function of the conditions, expectations, and commitment of staff as of any outside intervention, no matter how far reaching.
- Some of the challenges developers have encountered in serving high poverty schools have pointed to the need to supplement or refine their designs. For example, some developers are beginning to create more specific materials for curriculum and instruction while others are working closely with school districts to insure that adequate resources are made available.
- Developers pressured to serve more schools quickly often have few resources for monitoring or improving the quality of services they provide to the schools already involved with them in implementation. Data collection and feedback systems are not readily available, and very few developers have had third party observers dedicated to collecting information and providing analytic support related to the continuous improvement of the model and the quality of services provided to schools.

- There appears to be little financial support for model developers to engage in continuous improvement of their designs and services. Even fewer opportunities exist for collaborative sharing of knowledge, experience and tools among developers.

This said, I believe we, collectively, have both an opportunity to build on the promising work that has been done and a responsibility to persevere long and thoughtfully enough to know if CSR can have the profound effects we seek. With its procurements this year, OERI hopes to improve the probability that CSR as an intervention can bring about the improvements in student achievement that have alluded us for too long. In the process, we hope to create a learning community of developer organizations that will greatly add to our understanding of how to improve high poverty schools.

I encourage you to read the entire application package carefully in preparing your submission. Also please note under the Section entitled “The Application” is a checklist which we have included to help you ensure that your application is complete and that you have addressed each of the key points in the absolute priorities.

Finally, let me re-emphasize the fact that this competition is designed to fund mature, viable models with the greatest likelihood of serving large numbers of schools with high quality services. By current counts, the number of CSR models exceeds 280. Unfortunately, there are many more models struggling to scale up than we can possibly fund. In the end, we hope we can share what we learn from this effort to help all developers become more successful.

I would like to thank you in advance for your thoughtful response to this announcement.

Sincerely,  
C. Kent McGuire  
Assistant Secretary  
Educational Research and Improvement

[Federal Register: April 14, 2000 (Volume 65, Number 73)]  
[Notices]  
[Page 20315-20318]  
From the Federal Register Online via GPO Access [wais.access.gpo.gov]  
[DOCID:fr14ap00-151]

[[Page 20315]]

---

Part IV

Department of Education

---

Office of Educational Research and Improvement; Fund for the  
Improvement of Education--Comprehensive School Reform Capacity Building  
Grants; Notice Inviting Applications for New Awards for Fiscal Year  
(FY) 2000; Notice

[[Page 20316]]

---

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

[CFDA No. 84.215C]

Office of Educational Research and Improvement; Fund for the  
Improvement of Education--Comprehensive School Reform Capacity Building  
Grants; Notice Inviting Applications for New Awards for Fiscal Year  
(FY) 2000

Purpose of Program: The purpose of the Fund for the Improvement of  
Education (FIE) is to support nationally significant programs to  
improve the quality of education, assist all students to meet  
challenging State content standards, and contribute to the achievement  
of the National Education Goals. The purpose of this competition is to  
develop the long-term capacity of comprehensive school reform models to  
better serve schools as described in the Priorities section of this  
application notice.

Eligible Applicants: State and local educational agencies,  
institutions of higher education, and other public and private  
agencies, organizations, and institutions.

Applications Available: April 21, 2000.

Deadline for Transmittal of Applications: June 9, 2000.

Deadline for Intergovernmental Review: August 8, 2000.

Estimated Available Funds: \$15,000,000.

Estimated Range of Awards: \$500,000--\$1,000,000.

Estimated Average Size of Awards: \$750,000.

Maximum Award: We will reject any application that proposes a  
budget exceeding \$1,000,000 in any budget period.

Estimated Number of Awards: 20.

Note: The Department is not bound by any estimates in this  
notice.

Budget Period: 12 months.

Project Period: Up to 36 months.

Page Limit: The application narrative is where you, the applicant, address the selection criteria reviewers will use to evaluate your application. You must limit the application narrative to the equivalent of no more than 25 double-spaced pages using the following standards:

A page is 8.5" x 11", with printing on one side only.

\* Double-space all text in the application narrative (no more than three lines in a vertical inch)..

We strongly encourage applicants to use a font that is 12-point or larger with one-inch margins.

The page limit does not apply to the cover sheet; the budget section, including the narrative budget justification; the assurances and certifications; or the one-page abstract, the resumes, the bibliography, or the letters of support.

If the narrative section is more than the equivalent of the 25 double-spaced page limit, or if to meet the page limit, you use more than one side of the page or you use a larger page, our reviewers will not evaluate the portion of your application that goes beyond the equivalent of the specified page limit.

Applicable Regulations: (a) The Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR) in 34 CFR parts 74, 75, 77, 79, 80, 81, 82, 85, 86, 97, 98, and 99; and (b) The regulations in 34 CFR part 299.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The purpose of the Fund for the Improvement of Education (FIE) is to support nationally significant programs to improve the quality of education, assist all students to meet challenging State content standards, and contribute to the achievement of the National Education Goals. The purpose of this competition is to develop the long-term capacity of comprehensive school reform models to better serve schools as described in the Priorities section of this notice.

The Conference Report for the Department's fiscal year 2000 appropriation directs the Secretary to make awards to providers of comprehensive school reform models. A comprehensive school reform model is one in which all systems within a school--organization, instruction, professional development and management--and all of the school's classrooms are actively engaged in and accountable for the implementation of a common, articulated strategy to improve teaching and learning for all students in the school.

The Secretary believes that the purpose of the Comprehensive School Reform program is to substantially improve student achievement. These programs are intended to stimulate school-wide change covering virtually all aspects of school operations, rather than a piecemeal, fragmented approach to reform. In order to enhance the long-term capacity of models to provide higher quality services to greater numbers of schools, the Secretary believes that the model developers must engage in a process of continuous improvement based on careful analysis of their work.

In shaping these priorities, the Secretary has consulted widely with the field and drawn on the Department's experiences over the past three years with the Comprehensive School Reform and Demonstration Program (CSRDP). Recent reports on comprehensive school reform indicate that issues surrounding the implementation of models are very important to their success with teachers and students. Such issues as the district's role in supporting schools undertaking comprehensive school reform, the role of school leadership, community support, teacher capacity and availability of time, the relationship of the model to the existing curriculum in the school, the relationship of the model to the State and local standards and performance measures, among others, have a significant impact on the successful implementation of models in multiple sites throughout the nation. Most models have not developed a systematic way of collecting and analyzing information on implementation of their approach in schools. The Secretary believes that developing such systems will greatly enhance the long-term



capacity of models to improve their work and have a positive impact on schools.

To determine the capacity and needs of model developer organizations for funding under this competition, the Secretary requires that the applicants provide a thorough description of their evidence of effectiveness, particularly their student outcome data. He also requires that applicants demonstrate that their models are operating successfully in at least 15 schools to qualify as a national model, and that the model developers demonstrate that there is a significant unmet demand from schools and/or school districts for the model.

The Secretary has determined that the following activities are most likely to improve the long-term ability of models to provide high quality services to larger numbers of schools.

The Secretary believes that more attention needs to be given to activities that support the continuous improvement of models as they scale up and reach larger numbers of schools. Most comprehensive school reform models need to develop and implement data collection and feedback systems that track and provide timely feedback on such activities as: (a) the effectiveness of the professional development provided by the model; (b) the usefulness of materials and technical assistance provided by the model; (c) the model's effectiveness in schools with special populations; (d) the on-going support of staff for the model; and, (e) the model's success in achieving high fidelity implementation in multiple sites. The Secretary believes that providers of comprehensive school

[[Page 20317]]

reform models will benefit from developing and implementing data collection and feedback systems that track implementation in all schools adopting their approach. Further, these systems should include data to permit analysis of the role of the district in supporting implementation. Through these efforts the providers of comprehensive school reform models will increase their ability to serve more schools well. The Secretary believes that the assistance of a third-party evaluator will strengthen the effectiveness of some or all of the activities of this part of the priority.

There is research that suggests that the most effective way to increase student learning is to improve the curriculum and associated teaching strategies in the core subject areas and align them with state and local content standards and performance measures. The Secretary believes that the impact of some comprehensive school reform models would be improved by strengthening the teaching and learning that is a part of the model's design.

There is evidence that some comprehensive school reform models do not have the capacity to work effectively with the lowest performing schools. Yet, students in these schools are most often most at risk of failure. Therefore, the Secretary believes that some models would improve their capacity by developing materials and processes that specifically address the needs of the lowest performing schools which will allow them to expand their services into more of these schools.

There is evidence that some of the comprehensive school reform models do not address the concerns of special populations as successfully as they could. English language learners or children with disabilities or both often need specialized materials and support. Therefore, the Secretary believes developers should augment their models to better serve special populations of students.

The Secretary understands that developers of national comprehensive school reform models are finding that it is difficult to meet the demands of an increasing number of schools seeking assistance. Therefore, the Secretary asks the applicants to articulate their specific needs for increasing their capacity in order to scale-up their operation, and to describe the activities that will expand their

ability to work more effectively with larger numbers of schools.

Finally, the Secretary believes that the projects funded under this program will benefit from collaboration with other projects, both to improve their individual efforts as well as to contribute to the overall knowledge on comprehensive school reform. Projects will be expected to collaborate with Department of Education staff and expert consultants in the design of a core set of data collection instruments and analytic measures. It is expected that these will be used to provide continuous feedback on the quality of implementation across the designs and provide the public with data about the effectiveness of the designs in improving student achievement. Projects are required to set aside a minimum of ten (10) percent of their budget for this purpose.

## Priorities

### Absolute Priority

The Secretary gives absolute preference to applications that meet the absolute priority in the next paragraph. The Secretary funds under this priority only applications that meet this absolute priority. (34 CFR 75.105(c)(3)).

#### Absolute Priority--Comprehensive School Reform Models

An applicant must propose a set of activities that are designed to improve the quality of the services provided by a comprehensive school reform model and increase the number of schools served by the model. To be considered for funding, the comprehensive school reform model developer must provide evidence of the model's effectiveness in improving student achievement in high-poverty schools, particularly by providing information on the impact on student achievement. The model must also be operating successfully in at least fifteen (15) schools to be considered for funding under this program and demonstrate that there is a demand from schools interested in adopting the model. The applicant must explain the analytic process and the subsequent results of that process that led to their proposed activities for improving the quality and quantity of services to schools.

(a) Each application must propose one or more of the following activities. We will not consider other activities for funding:

(1) Designing and using continuous improvement processes to track and provide timely feedback on the model's services to adopting schools. [Participation of a third-party evaluator strengthens this effort. See Competitive Priority 1.]

(2) Strengthening the curriculum and instruction provided by the model, particularly in reading and mathematics, and aligning it with state and local content standards and performance measures.

(3) Developing processes and materials to better support the lowest performing and most troubled schools.

(4) Developing processes and materials to enhance the model's ability to serve special population of students (e.g., English language learners and students with disabilities.)

(5) Supporting other activities that the applicant demonstrates will allow them to serve a larger number of schools with high-quality services.

(b) In addition to the above menu of activities, the applicant must participate in the collaborative design and use of a core set of data collection instruments and analytic measures to carry out the formative and outcome evaluation activities. Department of Education staff will facilitate a process of bringing together project staff funded through this effort and expert consultants to collaborate on the design of the formative and outcome evaluation activities. Each project must set aside a minimum of 10 percent of its budget for this purpose.

### Competitive Priorities

The Secretary will give competitive preference, as indicated under

each priority, to applications that meet one or both of the following competitive priorities.

#### Competitive Priority 1

Priority will be given to projects that include a comprehensive formative evaluation plan, including a third-party evaluator.

Under 34 CFR 75.105(c)(2)(i) we award an additional five (5) points to an application, depending on how well the application meets the priority.

#### Competitive Priority 2

Priority will be given to projects that serve a school or schools located in rural or isolated areas.

Under 34 CFR 75.105(c)(2)(ii) we give preference to an application that meets the priority over an application of comparable merit that does not meet the priority.

#### Intergovernmental Review

This program is subject to the requirements of Executive Order 12372 and the regulations in 34 CFR part 79. The objective of the Executive order is to foster an intergovernmental partnership and a strengthened federalism by relying on processes developed by State and local governments for coordination and review of proposed Federal financial assistance. In accordance with the order,

[[Page 20318]]

this document is intended to provide early notification of the Department's specific plans and actions for this purpose.

#### Waiver of Proposed Rulemaking

In accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 553), it is the practice of the Department of Education to offer interested parties the opportunity to comment on proposed priorities that are not taken directly from statute. Ordinarily, this practice would have applied to the priorities in this notice. Section 437(d)(1) of the General Education Provisions Act (GEPA), however, exempts rules that apply to the first grant competition under a new program or substantially revised program from this requirement. The Conference Report for the Department's FY 2000 appropriation directs the Secretary to make awards ``to providers of comprehensive school models.'' This will be the first grant competition conducted under the authority of the Fund for Improvement of Education program, 20 U.S.C. 8001, that concerns comprehensive school reform. The Secretary, in accordance with section 437(d)(1) of GEPA, to ensure timely awards, has decided to forego public comment with respect to the priorities. The priorities will apply only to the FY 2000 grant competition.

For Applications Contact: Julie Coplin, U.S. Department of Education, 555 New Jersey Avenue, NW., room 502J, Washington, DC 20202-5645 Telephone: (202) 219-2089; e-mail [julie\\_coplin@ed.gov](mailto:julie_coplin@ed.gov). If you use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD), you may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1-800-877-8339.

For Further Information Contact: Cheryl Kane, U.S. Department of Education, 555 New Jersey Avenue, NW., room 604B Washington, DC 20202-5530. Telephone: (202) 208-2991; e-mail: [cheryl\\_kane@ed.gov](mailto:cheryl_kane@ed.gov). If you use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD), you may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1-800-877-8339.

#### Alternative Formats

Individuals with disabilities may obtain this document in an alternative format (e.g., Braille, large print, audiotape, or computer diskette) on request to the program contact person listed under For Applications Contact.

Individuals with disabilities may obtain a copy of the application package in an alternative format by contacting the person listed under For Applications Contact. However, the Department is not able to reproduce in an alternative format the standard forms included in the application package.

#### Electronic Access to This Document

You may view this document, as well as all other Department of Education documents published in the Federal Register, in text or Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) on the Internet at either of the following sites:

<http://ocfo.ed.gov/fedreg.htm>

<http://www.ed.gov/news.html>

To use the PDF you must have the Adobe Acrobat Reader Program with Search, which is available free at either of the previous sites. If you have questions about using the PDF, call the U.S. Government Printing Office (GPO) toll free, at 1-888-293-6498; or in the Washington, DC area at (202) 512-1530.

Note: The official version of this document is the document published in the Federal Register. Free Internet access to the official edition of the Federal Register and the Code of Federal Regulations is available on GPO Access at: <http://www.access.gpo.gov/nara/index.html>.

Program Authority: 20 U.S.C. 8001.

Dated: April 10, 2000.

C. Kent McGuire,

Assistant Secretary for Educational Research and Improvement.

[FR Doc. 00-9355 Filed 4-13-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4000-01-U

## **Fund for the Improvement of Education Program**

The Fund for the Improvement of Education (FIE) Program is authorized to support nationally significant programs and projects to improve the quality of education, assist all students to meet challenging State content standards and challenging State student performance standards, and contribute to the achievement of the National Education Goals. In addition to this broad authorization, the Program is authorized to support a variety of specific types of projects.

This application package describes the type of project supported under this competition.

### **FY 2000 Appropriations**

The Conference Report for the Department's fiscal year (FY) 2000 appropriation indicates that the appropriation for the Fund for the Improvement of Education Program "...includes \$15,000,000 to continue existing and award new contracts to providers of comprehensive school reform models. In making new awards, the Department should give priority to proposals to serve schools located in rural or isolated areas."

This competition responds to the directive provided from Congress.

## **What are the Selection Criteria for this grant competition?**

The Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR) govern selection of new grants and include selection procedures and a menu of general selection criteria and optional factors. Criteria and factors appropriate to the priority established for the competition are selected to evaluate the quality of each eligible grant application. For this new grant competition, the Secretary establishes the following Selection Criteria:

### **(1) Need for project (30 points)**

In determining the need for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factor:

- (A) The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps and weaknesses.

### **(2) Quality of the Project Design (40 points)**

In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (A) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.
- (B) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.
- (C) The extent to which performance feedback and continuous improvement are integral to the design of the proposed project.

### **(3) Quality of Project Personnel (10 points)**

In determining the quality of project personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. In addition, the Secretary considers the following factor:

- (A) The qualification, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.

### **(4) Quality of the Management Plan (20 points)**

In determining the adequacy of the management plan of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (A) The adequacy of mechanisms for ensuring high-quality products and services from the proposed project.
- (B) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

## **Government Performance and Results Act**

The Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) of 1993 places new management expectations and requirements on Federal departments and agencies by creating a framework for more effective planning, budgeting, program evaluation, and fiscal accountability for Federal programs. The intent of the Act is to improve public confidence by holding departments and agencies accountable for achieving program results. Departments and agencies must clearly describe the goals and objectives of their programs, identify resources and actions needed to accomplish these goals and objectives, develop a means of measuring progress made, and regularly report on their achievement. One important source of program information on successes and lessons learned is the project evaluation conducted under individual grants.

## How do I apply for an FIE: Comprehensive School Reform Capacity Building grant?

Carefully read the entire application package especially the **Priorities and Selection Criteria** which identify who is eligible to apply under this competition, what applicants must propose to do, and what criteria will be used to evaluate applications. The purpose of this competition is to further develop the long-term capacity of mature and viable comprehensive school reform (CSR) models to serve increasingly larger numbers of schools with high quality services.

### THE APPLICATION

**Each application should include:**

- 1. Title Page.** Use the Title Page form (ED Form 424) included in this application package.
- 2. Table of Contents.** Include a one page table of contents.
- 3. Abstract.** Provide a one page, double-spaced abstract that describes the need to be addressed by the project, summarizes the proposed activities, and identifies the intended outcomes.
- 4. Narrative.** Provide a narrative describing your project. You must limit the application narrative to the equivalent of no more than 25 double-spaced pages using the following standards:
  - A page is 8.5" x 11", with printing on one side only.
  - Double-space all text in the application narrative (no more than three lines in a vertical inch).

We strongly encourage applicants to use a font that is 12-point or larger with one-inch margins.

The page limit does not apply to the cover sheet; the budget section, including the narrative budget justification; the assurances and certifications; or the one-page abstract, the resumes, the bibliography, or the letters of support.

If the narrative section is more than the equivalent of the 25 double-spaced page limit, or if to meet the page limit, you use more than one side of the page or you use a larger page, our reviewers will not evaluate the portion of your application that goes beyond the equivalent of the specified page limit. (Please see copy of the Federal Register notice on page 3 of this application package for complete details.)



## 5. Priorities Checklist:

Absolute Priority–Comprehensive School Reform Models: you must do all of the following activities (review the exact requirements as stated in the Federal Register notice which is reprinted on page 3 of this application package):

- \_\_\_\_\_ Provide evidence of the comprehensive school reform model’s effectiveness in improving student achievement in high poverty schools, particularly by providing information on the impact on student achievement.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Provide evidence that the model is operating in 15 or more schools.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Provide evidence that there is a demand from schools interested in adopting the model.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Provide an explanation of the analysis conducted that led to the proposed activities in the application to improve the quality and quantity of the services to schools.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Propose to do **one or more** of the following activities (review the exact requirements as stated in the Federal Register notice which is reprinted on page 3 of this application package):
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Designing and using continuous improvement processes to track and provide timely feedback on the model’s services to adopting schools. [Participation of a third-party evaluator strengthens this effort. See Competitive Priority 1.]
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Strengthening the curriculum and instruction provided by the model, particularly in reading and mathematics, and aligning it with state and local content standards and performance measures.
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Developing processes and materials to better support the lowest performing and most troubled schools.
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Developing processes and materials to enhance the model’s ability to serve special populations of students (e.g., English language learners and students with disabilities).
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Supporting other activities that the applicant demonstrates will allow them to serve a larger number of schools with high-quality services.
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Provide evidence of willingness to collaborate in the design of a feedback system for continuous improvement.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Set aside a minimum of 10 percent of total budget request for this

collaboration activities.

[This set aside should be included under the budget category “Other.”]

Competitive Priorities: You may choose to do one or both or neither of the activities described under the competitive preference priorities (review the exact requirements as stated in the Federal Register notice which is reprinted on page 3 of this application package).

\_\_\_\_\_ Did you include a comprehensive formative evaluation plan, including a third-party evaluator (an additional 5 points will be added to the application, depending on how well the application meets the priority).

\_\_\_\_\_ Does your project serve a school or schools located in rural or isolate areas (preference will be given to an application that meets the priority over an application of comparable merit that does not meet the priority).

**6. Budget.** Use the attached Budget Summary form (ED Form 524), or a suitable facsimile, to present a complete budget summary for each year of the project. Please provide, **for each year**, a narrative which supports the expenditures listed on the Budget Summary. The minimum of 10 percent of the budget set aside for collaborative activities should be listed under the category “OTHER.” The budget narrative should clearly identify the set aside.

## THE APPENDICES

**Each application should be accompanied by an appendix which includes:**

**1. Project Personnel.** Please provide a brief summary of the background and experience of key project staff as they relate to the specific project activities you are proposing.

**2. Equitable Access and Participation.** Section 427 of the General Education Provision Act (GEPA) affects applicants under this program. **All applicants for new awards must include information in their applications to address this new provision in order to receive funding under this program.**

Section 427 requires each applicant (other than an individual person) to include in its application a description of the steps the applicant proposes to take to ensure equitable access to, and participation in, its Federally-assisted program for students, teachers, and other program beneficiaries with special needs.

This provision allows applicants discretion in developing the required description. The statute, highlights six types of barriers that can impede equitable access or participation: gender, race, national origin, color, disability, or age. Based on local circumstances, you should determine whether these or other barriers may prevent your students, teachers, etc. from such access or participation in, the Federally-funded project or activity. The description in your application of steps to be taken to overcome these barriers need not be lengthy; you may provide a clear and succinct description of how you plan to address those barriers that are applicable to your circumstances. In addition, the information may be provided in a single

narrative, or, if appropriate, may be discussed in connection with related topics in the application.

Each application should include this description in a clearly identified section of the appendix. It should support the discussion of similar issues in the narrative section of the application.

Section 427 is not intended to duplicate the requirements of civil rights statutes, but rather to ensure that, in designing their projects, applicants for Federal funds address equity concerns that may affect the ability of certain potential beneficiaries to fully participate in the project and to achieve to high standards. Consistent with program requirements and its approved application, an applicant may use Federal funds awarded to it to eliminate barriers it identifies.

The following examples may help illustrate how an applicant may comply with section 427.

(1) An applicant that proposes to carry out an adult literacy project serving, among others, adults with limited English proficiency, might describe in its application how it intends to distribute a brochure about the proposed project to such potential participants in their native language.

(2) An applicant that proposes to develop instructional materials for classroom use might describe how it will make the materials available on audio tape or in Braille for students who are blind.

(3) An applicant that proposes to carry out a model science program for secondary students and is concerned that the girls may be less likely than boys to enroll in the course, might indicate how it intends to conduct "outreach" efforts to girls to encourage their enrollment.

We recognize that many applicants may already be implementing effective steps to ensure equity of access and participation in their grant programs, and we appreciate your cooperation in responding to the requirements of this provision.

[The paperwork burden for compliance with Section 427 of GEPA is recorded under OMB Control No. 1801-0004 (Expiration Date 8/31/2001). The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to vary from 1 to 3 hours per response, with an average of 1.5 hours, including the time to review instructions search existing data resources, gather and maintain the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate(s) or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, Washington, DC 20202-4651.]

**3.** The following forms are required in all applications. They may be photocopied as necessary.

--Title Page form (**ED Form 424**)

--Budget Summary form (**ED Form 524**)

--Assurances - Non-Construction Programs (**Standard Form SF424B**)

--Certifications Regarding Lobbying; Debarment, Suspension and Other Responsibility matters; and Drug-Free Workplace Requirements (**ED Form 80-0013**)

--Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (**Standard Form LLL**)

## **OTHER ATTACHMENTS**

**Other attachments are not encouraged. Reviewers will have a limited time to read each application. Supplementary materials such as videotapes, CD-ROMs, files on disks, commercial publications, press clippings, testimonial letters, etc. will probably not be reviewed and will not be returned to the applicant.**

## **How do I submit an application?**

**The deadline for transmittal of applications is June 9, 2000.**

If you want to apply for a grant and be considered for funding, you must meet the following deadline requirements:

You must mail the application on or before the deadline date to:

U.S. Department of Education  
Application Control Center, Room 3633  
Attention: 84.215C  
400 Maryland Avenue, SW  
Washington, DC 20202-4725

You must show one of the following as proof of mailing

- (1) A legibly dated U.S. Postal Service Postmark.
- (2) A legible mail receipt with the date of mailing stamped by the U.S. Postal Service.
- (3) A dated shipping label, invoice, or receipt from a commercial carrier, or
- (4) Any other proof of mailing acceptable to the U.S. Secretary of Education.

If an application is sent through the U.S. Postal Service, we do not accept either of the following as proof of mailing:

- (1) A private metered postmark, or
- (2) A mail receipt that is not dated by the U.S. Postal Service.

An applicant should note that the U.S. Postal Service does not uniformly provide a dated postmark. Before relying on this method, an applicant should check with its local post office.

Each late applicant will be notified that its application will not be considered.

### **If You Deliver Your Application by Hand**

You or your courier must hand deliver the application by 4:30 p.m. (Washington, DC time) on or before **June 9, 2000 (the deadline date)** to:

U.S. Department of Education  
Application Control Center  
Attention: 84.215C  
Room 3633, Regional Office Building 3  
7<sup>th</sup> and D Streets, SW  
Washington, DC 20202-4725

The Application Control Center accepts application deliveries daily between 8:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. (Washington, DC time), except Saturdays, Sundays and Federal holidays. The Center accepts application deliveries through the D Street entrance only. A person delivering an application must show identification to enter the building.

## **Number of Copies of the Application**

Applicants are required to submit one (1) signed original and two (2) copies of the application. Each copy of the application must be covered with a Title Page (form included in these guidelines) or a reasonable facsimile.

**All applicants are encouraged to submit voluntarily an additional four (4) copies of the application. The absence of these additional copies will not influence the selection process.**

**All sections of the application and all sections of the appendix must be suitable for photocopying to be included in the review (at least one copy of the application should be unbound and suitable for photocopying).**

## **GRANT APPLICATION RECEIPT ACKNOWLEDGMENT**

If you fail to receive the notification of application receipt within fifteen (15) days from the closing date, call:

U.S. Department of Education  
Coordination and Control Branch  
202-708-9493

## **ASSURANCES AND CERTIFICATIONS**

Applications selected for funding will require a signed ED Form 80-0013 (Certifications Regarding Lobbying; Debarment, Suspension and Other Responsibility Matters; and Drug-Free Workplace Requirements), Standard Form SF 424B (Assurances - Non-Construction Programs), and Standard Form LLL (Disclosure of Lobbying Activities) before an award is made.

[NOTE: In the printed application package, the Standard Forms and Certifications and Assurances are located here. In the electronic version, the forms are located at the end of the package.]

### **The forms that are needed are:**

- ◆ Title Page (Ed Form 424 with Instructions with the Protection of Human Subjects Attachment and Instructions)
- ◆ Budget form (Ed Form 524 with Instructions)
- ◆ Assurances - Non-Construction Programs (Standard Form SF424B)  
Certifications Regarding Lobbying; Debarment, Suspension and Other Responsibility matters; Drug-Free Workplace Requirements (ED Form 80-0013)
- ◆ Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (Standard Form LLL)

*Electronic versions of these forms and instructions in Adobe PDF, Microsoft Word and WordPerfect formats are available at: <http://ocfo.ed.gov/grntinfo/appforms.htm>*

## **Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs**

State Single Point of Contact -- Executive Order 12372 and List of State Contacts.

Executive Order 12372 and 34 CFR 79 apply to this program.

The objective of the Executive order is to foster an intergovernmental partnership and to strengthen federalism by relying on State and local processes for State and local government coordination and review of proposed Federal financial assistance.

Applicants must contact the appropriate State Single Point of Contact to find out about, and to comply with, the State's process under Executive Order 12372. Applicants proposing to perform activities in more than one State should immediately contact the Single Point of Contact for each of those States and follow the procedure established in each of those States under the Executive order. A listing containing the Single Point of Contact for each State is included in this appendix.

In States that have not established a process or chosen a program for review, State, areawide, regional, and local entities may submit comments directly to the Department.

Any State Process Recommendation and other comments submitted by a State Single Point of Contact and any comments from State, areawide, regional, and local entities must be mailed or hand-delivered by the date indicated in the actual application notice to the following address:

The Secretary, EO 12372  
CFDA# 84.215V  
U.S. Department of Education, room R7W301,  
400 Maryland Avenue, SW.,  
Washington, DC 20202.

Proof of mailing will be determined on the same basis as applications (see 34 CFR 75.102). Recommendations or comments may be hand-delivered until 4:30 p.m. (Eastern time) on the date indicated in the actual application notice.

**PLEASE NOTE THAT THE ABOVE ADDRESS IS NOT THE SAME ADDRESS AS THE ONE TO WHICH THE APPLICANT SUBMITS ITS COMPLETED APPLICATION. DO NOT SEND APPLICATIONS TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.**

## STATE SINGLE POINTS OF CONTACT

(As of October 1, 1999)

**Note:** In accordance with Executive Order #12372, Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs, this listing represents the designated State Single Points of Contact (SSPOCs). Because participation is voluntary, some States and Territories no longer participate in the process. These include: Alabama, Alaska, American Samoa, Colorado, Connecticut, Hawaii, Idaho, Kansas, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Vermont, Virginia, and Washington.

The jurisdictions not listed no longer participate in the process. However, an applicant is still eligible to apply for a grant or grants even if its respective State, Territory, Commonwealth, etc. does not have a (SSPOC).

<b>ARIZONA</b>  Ms. Joni Saad State of Arizona Arizona Department of Commerce Office of Economic Planning and Development Arizona State Clearinghouse 3800 North Central Avenue, Fourteenth Floor Phoenix, Arizona 85012 Telephone: (602) 280-1315 FAX: (602) 280-8144 <a href="mailto:Jonis@ep.state.az.us">Jonis@ep.state.az.us</a>	<b>ARKANSAS</b>  Mr. Tracy L. Copeland Manager, State Clearinghouse State of Arkansas Office of Intergovernmental Services Department of Finance and Administration 1515 7 <sup>th</sup> Street, Room 412 Little Rock, Arkansas 72203 Telephone: (501) 682-1074 FAX: (501) 682-5206 <a href="mailto:TlCopeland@dfa.state.ar.us">TlCopeland@dfa.state.ar.us</a>
<b>CALIFORNIA</b>  State of California Governor's Office of Planning and Research State Clearinghouse Attn: Sheila Brown Street Address: 1400 Tenth Street, Room 121 Sacramento, CA 95814 Mailing Address: P.O. Box 3044 Sacramento, CA 95812-3044 Telephone: (916) 445-0613 FAX: (916) 323-3018 <a href="http://www.opr.ca.gov/clearinghouse.html">www.opr.ca.gov/clearinghouse.html</a>	<b>DELAWARE</b>  State of Delaware Executive Department Office of the Budget Charles H. Hopkins Deputy Director 540 S. Dupont Highway 3 <sup>rd</sup> Floor Dover, DE 19901 Telephone: (302) 739-3323 FAX: (302) 739-5661 <a href="mailto:Chopkins@state.de.us">Chopkins@state.de.us</a> <a href="http://www.state.de.us/budget/budget.htm">http://www.state.de.us/budget/budget.htm</a>



<p><b>DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA</b></p> <p>Mr. Charles Nichols  State Single Point of Contact  Government of the District of Columbia  Office of the Chief Financial Officer  Office of Grants Management and Development  717 14<sup>th</sup> Street, NW, Suite 1200  Washington, DC 20005  Telephone: (202) 727-1700 (Direct)  Telephone: (202) 727-6537 (Secretary)  FAX: (202) 727-1617  <a href="mailto:OGMD-OGMD@dcgov.org">E-mail: OGMD-OGMD@dcgov.org</a></p>	<p><b>FLORIDA</b></p> <p>State of Florida  Florida State Clearinghouse  Department of Community Affairs  2555 Shumard Oak Blvd.  Tallahassee, Florida 32399-2100  Telephone: (850) 922-5438  FAX: (850) 414-0479  Contact: Ms. Cherie Trainor  Telephone: (850) 414-5495  <a href="mailto:Cherie.trainor@dca.state.fl.us">Cherie.trainor@dca.state.fl.us</a></p>
<p><b>GEORGIA</b></p> <p>Ms. Debra Stephens, Coordinator  State of Georgia  Office of Planning and Budget  Georgia State Clearinghouse  270 Washington Street, S.W.  8<sup>th</sup> Floor  Atlanta, GA 30334  Telephone: (404) 656-3855  FAX: (404) 656-7901  <a href="mailto:ssda@mail.opb.state.ga.us">ssda@mail.opb.state.ga.us</a></p>	<p><b>ILLINOIS</b></p> <p>Ms. Virginia Bova, State Single Point of Contact  State of Illinois  Department of Commerce and Community Affairs  Policy Development/Planning &amp; Research  James R. Thompson Center  100 West Randolph, Suite 3-400  Chicago, IL 60601  Telephone: (312) 814-6028  FAX: (312) 814-1800  <a href="mailto:vbova@commerce.state.il.us">vbova@commerce.state.il.us</a>  <a href="http://www.state.il.us/fedclear/">http://www.state.il.us/fedclear/</a></p>
<p><b>INDIANA</b></p> <p>Ms. Allison Becker, Budget Analyst  State of Indiana  Indiana State Budget Agency  Office of the Director  212 State House, Room 121  Indianapolis, IA 46204-2796  Telephone: (317) 232-5610  Telephone: (317) 232-7221 (Direct Line)  FAX: (317) 233-3323  <a href="http://www.state.in.us/sba/index.html">http://www.state.in.us/sba/index.html</a></p>	<p><b>IOWA</b></p> <p>Mr. Steven R. McCann  State of Iowa  Department of Economic Development  Community and Rural Development Division  City Development Board  200 East Grand Avenue  Des Moines, IA 50309  Telephone: (515) 242-4719  FAX: (515) 242-4809  <a href="mailto:Steve.mccann@ided.state.ia.us">Steve.mccann@ided.state.ia.us</a></p>
<p><b>KENTUCKY</b></p> <p>Mr. Kevin J. Goldsmith, Director  Ms. Sandra Brewer, Executive Secretary  State of Kentucky  Intergovernmental Affairs  Office of the Governor  700 Capitol Avenue  Frankfort, KY 40601  Telephone: (502) 564-2611  FAX: (502) 564-0437  <a href="mailto:Kgoldmkgsmith@mail.state.ky.us">Kgoldmkgsmith@mail.state.ky.us</a>  <a href="mailto:Sbrewer@mail.state.ky.us">Sbrewer@mail.state.ky.us</a></p>	<p><b>MAINE</b></p> <p>Ms.. Joyce Benson  State of Maine  Office of the Governor  Executive  Maine State Planning Office  184 State Street  Station #38  Augusta, ME 04333-0038  Telephone: (207) 287-3261  FAX: (207) 287-6489  <a href="mailto:Joyce.benson@state.me.us">Joyce.benson@state.me.us</a></p>

<p><b>MARYLAND</b></p> <p>Ms. Linda Janey  Manager, Planning and Project Review  State of Maryland  Maryland Office of Planning  301 W. Preston Street – Room 1104  Baltimore, MD 21201-2365  Telephone: (410) 767-4490  Telephone: (410) 767-4395  FAX: (410) 767-4480  <a href="mailto:linda@mail.op.state.md.us">linda@mail.op.state.md.us</a></p>	<p><b>MICHIGAN</b></p> <p>State of Michigan  Mr. Richard Pfaff, Regional Review Coordinator  Southeast Michigan Council of Governments  Federal Project Regional Review  660 Plaza Drive – Suite 1900  Detroit, MI 48226  Telephone: (313) 961-4266  FAX: (313) 961-4869  <a href="mailto:pfaff@semcog.org">pfaff@semcog.org</a></p>
<p><b>MISSISSIPPI</b></p> <p>Ms. Catherine Mallette, Clearinghouse Officer  State of Mississippi  Department of Finance and Administration  550 High Street  303 Walters Sillers Building  Jackson, MS 39201-3087  Telephone: (601) 359-6762  FAX: (601) 359-6758  <a href="http://www.dfa.state.ms.us/">http://www.dfa.state.ms.us/</a></p>	<p><b>MISSOURI</b></p> <p>Ms. Lois Pohl, Executive Director  State of Missouri  Office of Administration  Division of General Services  Missouri Commission on Intergovernmental  Cooperation  Federal Assistance Clearinghouse  P.O. Box 809  Jefferson Building, Room 915  Jefferson City, MO 65102  Telephone: (573) 751-4834  FAX: (573) 522-4395  <a href="mailto:lpohl01@mail.state.mo.us">lpohl01@mail.state.mo.us</a>  <a href="mailto:pohl@mail.oa.state.mo.us">pohl@mail.oa.state.mo.us</a></p>
<p><b>NEVADA</b></p> <p>Ms. Heather Elliott  Grants and Project Analyst  State of Nevada  Department of Administration  Budget Division  Planning Section  Nevada State Clearinghouse/SPOC  209 East Musser Street, Room 200  Carson City, NV 89701-4298  Telephone: (775) 684-0223 Maud Naroll, Chief)  Telephone: (775) 684-0209 (Heather Elliott)  FAX: (775) 684-0260  <a href="mailto:Helliott@govmail.state.nv.us">Helliott@govmail.state.nv.us</a></p>	<p><b>NEW HAMPSHIRE</b></p> <p>Mr. Jeffrey H. Taylor, Director  State of New Hampshire  Executive Department  Office of State Planning  Intergovernmental Review Process  Attn: Mr. Mike Blake  21<del>2</del> Beacon Street  Concord, NH 03301  Telephone: (603) 271-2155  FAX: (603) 271-1728  <a href="mailto:Jtaylor@osp.state.nh.us">Jtaylor@osp.state.nh.us</a></p>

<p><b>NEW MEXICO</b></p> <p>Mr. Nick Mandell, Website Manager  State Single Point of Contact  State of New Mexico  Department of Finance and Administration  Local Government Division  New Mexico Federal Clearinghouse  Bataan Memorial Building – Room 201  Santa Fe, NM 87503  Telephone: (505) 827-4991  FAX: (505) 827-4984  <a href="mailto:nmandel@dfa.state.nm.us">nmandel@dfa.state.nm.us</a></p>	<p><b>NORTH CAROLINA</b></p> <p>Ms. Jeanette Furney  Intergovernmental Review Coordinator  State of North Carolina  North Carolina Department of Administration  State Clearinghouse  116 West Jones Street – Suite 5106  Raleigh, NC 27603-8003  Telephone: (919) 807-2425  FAX: (919) 733-9571  <a href="http://www.doa.state.nc.us/doa/clearing/welcome.htm">http://www.doa.state.nc.us/doa/clearing/welcome.htm</a>  <a href="mailto:jeanette_furney@mail.doa.state.nc.us">jeanette_furney@mail.doa.state.nc.us</a></p>
<p><b>NORTH DAKOTA</b></p> <p>Governor's Office  Office of Management &amp; Budget  Office of Intergovernmental Assistance  Division of Community Services  600 East Boulevard Avenue  Department 105  Bismark, ND 58505-0170  Telephone: (701) 328-2094 (Clerical Support)  FAX: (701) 328-2308  <a href="http://www.state.nd.us/dcs">http://www.state.nd.us/dcs</a></p>	<p><b>RHODE ISLAND</b></p> <p>Mr. Kevin Nelson  Review Coordinator  State of Rhode Island  Department of Administration  Office of Library &amp; Information Services  Division of Planning  One Capitol Hill, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  Providence RI 02908-5870  Telephone: (401) 222-1220 (Secretary)  Telephone: (401) 222-2093 (Direct)  FAX: (401) 222-2083  <a href="mailto:knelson@doa.state.ri.us">knelson@doa.state.ri.us</a></p>
<p><b>SOUTH CAROLINA</b></p> <p>Ms. Omeagia Burgess  Grant Coordinator  State of South Carolina  Office of State Budget  1122 Ladies Street – 12<sup>th</sup> Floor  Columbia, SC 29201  Telephone: (803) 734-0494  FAX: (803) 734-0645  <a href="mailto:Aburgess@budget.state.sc.us">Aburgess@budget.state.sc.us</a></p>	<p><b>TEXAS</b></p> <p>Mr. Tom Adams  Director, Intergovernmental Coordination  State of Texas  State Single Point of Contact  Office of the Governor  Office of Budget and Planning  P.O. Box 12428  Austin, TX 78711-2428  Telephone: (512) 463-1771  FAX: (512) 936-2681  <a href="mailto:tadams@governor.state.tx.us">tadams@governor.state.tx.us</a></p>
<p><b>UTAH</b></p> <p>Ms. Carolyn B. Wright, Research Analyst  State of Utah  Governor's Office of Planning and Budget  Resource Planning/Legal Review  116 State Capitol  Salt Lake City, UT 84114  Telephone: (801) 538-1535 (Direct)  FAX: (801) 538-1547  <a href="mailto:cwright@gov.state.ut.us">cwright@gov.state.ut.us</a></p>	<p><b>WEST VIRGINIA</b></p> <p>Mr. Glenn F. (Fred) Cutlip, Director  State of West Virginia  West Virginia Development Office  Community Development Division  Capitol Complex, Bldg. 6, Room 553  1900 Washington Street East  Charleston, WV 25305-0311  Telephone: (304) 558-4010 x048  FAX: (304) 558-3248  <a href="mailto:fcutlip@wvdo.org">fcutlip@wvdo.org</a></p>

<p><b>WISCONSIN</b></p> <p>Mr. Jeffrey T. Smith, Section Chief State of Wisconsin Wisconsin Department of Administration 101 East Wilson Street – 6<sup>th</sup> Floor P.O. Box 7868 Madison, WI 53707 Telephone: (608) 266-0267 FAX: (608) 267-6931 <a href="mailto:jeffrey.smith@doa.state.wi.us">jeffrey.smith@doa.state.wi.us</a></p>	<p><b>WYOMING</b></p> <p>Ms. Sandy Ross, Executive Assistant State of Wyoming State Single Point of Contact Department of Administration and Information A&amp;I Planning and Coordination Emerson Building 2001 Capitol Avenue, Room 214 Cheyenne, WY 82002 Telephone: (307) 777-5492 FAX: (307) 777-3696 <a href="mailto:sross1@missc.state.wy.us">sross1@missc.state.wy.us</a> <a href="http://www-cio.state.wy.us">http://www-cio.state.wy.us</a></p>
<p><b>U.S. TERRITORIES</b></p> <p><b>GUAM</b></p> <p>Mr. Joseph Rivera, Acting Director Territory of Guam Office of the Governor Bureau of Budget &amp; Management Research P.O. Box 2950 HAGÂTÑA, GU 96932 Telephone: (671) 475-9411 Telephone: (671) 475-9412 Telephone: (671) 475-9429 FAX: (671) 475-2825 <a href="mailto:jer@ns.gov.gu">jer@ns.gov.gu</a> <a href="mailto:bbmr@ns.gov.gu">bbmr@ns.gov.gu</a></p>	<p><b>U.S. TERRITORIES</b></p> <p><b>PUERTO RICO</b></p> <p>Mr. José Caballero-Mercado, Chairman Commonwealth of Puerto Rico Puerto Rico Planning Board Federal Proposals Review Office Minillas Government Center P.O. Box 41119 San Juan, PR 00940-1119 Telephone: (787) 727-4444 (PRPB) Telephone: (787) 723-6190 (FPRO) FAX: (787) 724-3270 <a href="mailto:j@jp.prstar.net">j@jp.prstar.net</a></p>
<p><b>NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS</b></p> <p>Mrs. Virginia Villagomez, Acting Special Assistant Government of the Commonwealth Of the Northern Mariana Islands Office of the Governor Office of Management and Budget Capitol Hill, Caller Box 10007 Saipan, MP 96950 Telephone: (670) 664-2265 Telephone: (670) 664-2266 Telephone: (670) 664-2267 FAX: (670) 664-2272 <a href="mailto:omb.villagomez@saipan.com">omb.villagomez@saipan.com</a></p>	<p><b>THE UNITED STATES VIRGIN ISLANDS</b></p> <p>Mr. Ira Mills, Director Government of the Virgin Islands of the United States U.S.V.I. Office of Management &amp; Budget No. 41 Norre Gade Emancipation Garden Station, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Charlotte Amalie, U.S.V.I. 00802 <a href="http://www.gov.vi/omb/">http://www.gov.vi/omb/</a> <i>Please direct all questions and correspondence about intergovernmental review to Daisy Millin.</i> Telephone: (340) 774-0750 FAX: (340) 776-0069 <a href="mailto:irmills@usvi.org">irmills@usvi.org</a> <a href="mailto:Dmillin@usvi.org">Dmillin@usvi.org</a></p>

Note: This list is based on the most current information provided by the States. Changes to this list may be provided by a State's officially designated representative by sending a message to [grants@omb.eop.gov](mailto:grants@omb.eop.gov), or sending correspondence to the following postal address:

Attn: Grants Management  
Office of Management and Budget  
New Executive Office Building  
Suite 6025  
725 17<sup>th</sup> Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20503

This list is updated every six months and is also published biannually in the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA).

# APPLICATION PACKAGE CHECKLIST

## APPLICATIONS MUST BE TRANSMITTED NO LATER THAN

**June 9, 2000**

### CHECK:

- \_\_\_\_\_ The Application Title Page has been completed according to the instructions on the back of the title page.
- \_\_\_\_\_ The Application Title Page has been **signed and dated by an authorized official** and the signed original has been included with your submission.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Submit one original plus two copies of the application and the appendix (including one unbound copy suitable for photocopying) PLUS four voluntarily submitted additional copies of the application.

EACH COPY OF THE APPLICATION SHOULD INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING SECTIONS:

#### The Application

- \_\_\_\_\_ the title page form
- \_\_\_\_\_ table of contents
- \_\_\_\_\_ one-page abstract
- \_\_\_\_\_ narrative (no more than 25 pages)
- \_\_\_\_\_ the budget summary form
- \_\_\_\_\_ detailed budget justification

#### The Appendix

- \_\_\_\_\_ list of project personnel
- \_\_\_\_\_ statement of equitable participation (GEPA 427)
- \_\_\_\_\_ certifications and assurances

#### ADDRESS AND TRANSMITTAL DATE

U.S. Department of Education  
Application Control Center, Room 3633  
Attention: 84.215C  
400 Maryland Avenue, SW  
Washington, DC 20202-4725

Telephone: 202-708-9493

**All applications must be transmitted by June 9, 2000.**

**IMPORTANT NOTICE  
TO PROSPECTIVE PARTICIPANTS  
IN U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
CONTRACT AND GRANT PROGRAMS**

**GRANTS**

Applicants for grants from the U.S. Department of Education (ED) have to compete for limited funds.

Deadlines assure all applicants that they will be treated fairly and equally, without last minute haste.

For these reasons, ED must set strict deadlines for grant applications. Prospective applicants can avoid disappointment if they understand that:

Failure to meet a deadline will mean that an applicant will be  
Rejected without any consideration whatever.

The rules, including the deadline, for applying for each grant are published, individually, in the Federal Register. A one-year subscription to the Register may be obtained by sending \$340.00 to: Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402-9371. (Send check or money order only, no cash or stamps.)

The instructions in the Federal Register must be followed exactly. Do not accept any other advice you may receive. No ED employee is authorized to extend any deadline published in the Register.

Questions regarding submission of applications may be addressed to:

U.S. Department of Education  
Application Control Center  
Washington, D.C. 20202-4725

**CONTRACTS**

Competitive procurement actions undertaken by the ED are governed by the Federal Procurement Regulation and implementing ED Procurement Regulation.

Generally, prospective competitive procurement actions are synopsisized in the Commerce Business Daily (CBD). Prospective offerors are therein advised of the nature of the procurement and where to apply for copies of the Request for Proposals (RFP).

Offerors are advised to be guided solely by the contents of the CBD synopsis and the instructions contained in the RFP. Questions regarding the submission of offers should be addressed to the Contracts Specialist identified on the face page of the RFP.

Offers are judged in competition with others, and failure to conform with any substantive requirements of the RFP will result in rejection of the offer without any consideration whatever.

Do not accept any advice you receive that is contrary to instructions contained in either the CBD synopsis or the RFP. No ED employee is authorized to consider a proposal which is non-responsive to the RFP.

A subscription to the CBD is available for \$208.00 per year via second class mailing or \$261.00 per year via first class mailing. Information included in the Federal Acquisition Regulation is contained in Title 48, Code of Federal Regulations, Chapter 1 (\$49.00). The foregoing publication may be obtained by sending your check or money order only, no cash or stamps, to:

Superintendent of Documents  
U.S. Government Printing Office  
Washington, D.C. 20402-9371

In an effort to be certain this important information is widely disseminated, this notice is being included in all ED mail to the public. You may therefore, receive more than one notice. If you do, we apologize for any annoyance it may cause you.

ED FORM 5348, 8/92

REPLACES ED FORM 5348, 6/86 WHICH IS OBSOLETE



## **APPENDIX I**

### **The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 as amended by the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994**

#### **TITLE X--PROGRAMS OF NATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE**

##### **PART A--FUND FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF EDUCATION**

##### **SEC. 10101. FUND FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF EDUCATION (20 USC 8001)**

(a) Fund Authorized.--From funds appropriated under subsection (d), the Secretary is authorized to support nationally significant programs and projects to improve the quality of education, assist all students to meet challenging State content standards and challenging State student performance standards, and contribute to achievement of the National Education Goals. The Secretary is authorized to carry out such programs and projects directly or through grants to, or contracts with, State and local educational agencies, institutions of higher education, and other public and private agencies, organizations, and institutions.

(b) Uses of Funds--

(1) In general--Funds under this section may be used for--

(A) activities that will promote systemic education reform at the State and local levels, such as--

(i) research and development related to challenging State content and challenging State student performance standards and opportunity-to-learn standards or strategies for student learning;

(ii) the development and evaluation of model strategies for--

(I) assessment of student learning;

(II) professional development for teachers and administrators;

(III) parent and community involvement; and

(IV) other aspects of systemic reform;

(iii) developing and evaluating strategies for eliminating ability-grouping practices, and developing policies and programs that place all students on a college-preparatory path of study, particularly in academic fields such as mathematics, science, English, and social studies, including comprehensive inservice programs for teachers and pupil services personnel and academic enrichment programs that supplement regular courses for students;

(iv) developing and evaluating programs that directly involve parents and family members in the academic progress of their children;

(v) developing and evaluating strategies for integrating instruction and assessment such that teachers and administrators can focus on what students should know and be able to do at particular grade levels, which instruction shall promote the synthesis of knowledge, encourage the development of problem-solving skills drawing on a vast range of disciplines, and promote the development of higher order thinking by all students; and

- (vi) developing and evaluating strategies for supporting professional development for teachers across all disciplines and for pupil services personnel, guidance counselors, and administrators, including inservice training that improves the skills of pupil services personnel, counselors and administrators for working with students from diverse populations;
- (B) demonstrations at the State and local levels that are designed to yield nationally significant results, including approaches to public school choice and school-based decisionmaking;
- (C) joint activities with other agencies to assist the effort to achieve the National Education Goals, including activities related to improving the transition from preschool to school and from school to work, as well as activities related to the integration of education and health and social services;
- (D) activities to promote and evaluate counseling and mentoring for students, including intergenerational mentoring;
- (E) activities to promote and evaluate coordinated pupil services programs;
- (F) activities to promote comprehensive health education;
- (G) activities to promote environmental education;
- (H) activities to promote consumer, economic, and personal finance education, such as saving, investing, and entrepreneurial education;
- (I) activities to promote programs to assist students to demonstrate competence in foreign languages;
- (J) studies and evaluation of various education reform strategies and innovations being pursued by the Federal Government, States, and local educational agencies;
- (K) activities to promote metric education;
- (L) the identification and recognition of exemplary schools and programs, such as Blue Ribbon Schools;
- (M) programs designed to promote gender equity in education by evaluating and eliminating gender bias in instruction and educational materials, identifying, and analyzing gender inequities in educational practices, and implementing and evaluating educational policies and practices designed to achieve gender equity;
- (N) programs designed to reduce excessive student mobility, retain students who move within a school district at the same school, educate parents about the effect of mobility on a child's education and encourage parents to participate in school activities;

- (O) experiential-based learning, such as service-learning;
- (P) the development and expansion of public-private partnership programs which extend the learning experience, via computers, beyond the classroom environment into student homes through such programs as the Buddy System Computer Project;
- (Q) other programs and projects that meet the purposes of this section;
- (R) activities to promote child abuse education and prevention programs;
- (S) activities to raise standards and expectations for academic achievement among all students, especially disadvantaged students traditionally underserved in schools;
- (T) activities to provide the academic support, enrichment and motivation to enable all students to reach such standards;
- (U) demonstrations relating to the planning and evaluations of the effectiveness of projects under which local educational agencies or schools contract with private management organizations to reform a school or schools;
- (V) demonstrations that are designed to test whether prenatal and counseling provided to pregnant students may have a positive effect on pregnancy outcomes, with such education and counseling emphasizing the importance of prenatal care, the value of sound diet and nutrition habits, and the harmful effects of smoking, alcohol, and substance abuse on fetal development;
- (W) programs under section 10102;
- (X) programs under section 10103;
- (Y) programs under section 10104; and
- (Z) programs under section 10105;

## **GRANT APPLICATION RECEIPT ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

If you fail to receive the notification of application receipt within fifteen (15) days from the closing date call:

U.S. Department of Education  
Application Control Center  
(202) 708-9493

## **GRANT AND CONTRACT FUNDING INFORMATION**

The Department of Education provides information about grant and contract opportunities electronically in several ways:

ED Internet Home Page      <http://www.ed.gov> (WWW address)

OCFO Web Page Internet      <http://ocfo.ed.gov> (WWW address)